

St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

PUBLISHED BY
THE DISPATCH PUBLISHING CO.
JAMES F. FARMER, President.

(Entered as the Post Office at St. Louis, Mo., as second class matter.)

TERMS OF THE DAILY.
One year, postage paid..... \$9.00
Six months..... 4.50
Three months..... 2.50
One month..... .50
By the week (delivered by carrier).....
By the week (delivered by carrier).....
Subscribers who fail to receive their paper regularly will confer a favor upon us by reporting the same to this office by postal card.

THE WEEKLY.
One year, postage paid..... \$1.00
Six months, postage paid..... .50
All business or news letters or telegrams should be addressed.

POST-DISPATCH,
515 and 517 Market street.

TWELVE PAGES.

SATURDAY, JULY 25, 1893.

We are very much mistaken if the public sentiment of the people of the United States will not protest respectfully, but firmly, against the choice of Central Park for the burial place of Grant.

The discussion among our Congressmen about the Federal appointments has been brought out into the healthy daylight of publicity. Mr. GLOVER has held the floor, Mr. CLARKE has spoken, Mr. O'NEILL has also taken part in the debate. Let the discussion continue.

SENATOR VEST is traveling in a special car with his family. As a special car costs about \$100 a day, we are afraid that the Senator is dead-headed in his. His colleague never indulges in this impropriety. If Senator COCKRELL should wish to take his family traveling he would have to charter a train.

The selection of Central Park as a burial place for Grant is an unfortunate mistake which is to be regretted, but which can hardly be remedied now. There is something incongruous in the idea of burying any one in a public pleasure ground, and in the present instance, as the funeral is a national affair, in charge of the national authorities, and in recognition of national services, the proper burial place would undoubtedly be the National Capital.

The continued hot weather makes the demand for a Fresh Air Fund more imperative. The cool weather of the earlier summer diverted the attention of the charitable and well-disposed from this most effective form of relief, but it is impossible to resist the warning of the continued heat. The movement has been started and it should be well supported. The POST-DISPATCH will be very glad to receive and acknowledge any subscriptions and see that they reach their destination.

The branch Penitentiary, which was to cost \$800,000 when it went through the Appropriation Committee, has already expanded to an outlay of \$1,000,000, now that it has been assigned to the breezy site on Walker's Creek near the Kansas City Belt Road. This suggests a curious problem in political arithmetic. If the cost of a penitentiary increases from \$800,000 to \$1,000,000 on its way from the Legislature to its location, how much will it cost before the contractors get through with it?

The charge made against Judge DENISON, that he has not given his whole time to the duties of his office, can probably be made to stick, and thus a place may be made for one of the faithful. The promptness of the City Council in uncovering and punishing this bold, bad man should serve as a rebuke to President CLAYMAN, but it may be a dangerous precedent in St. Louis. If none of our municipal officials are to remain in office unless they give their whole time to their duties the City Hall will soon look lonesome.

New York is up betimes and has appointed a first-class committee to take charge of the share of New York in meeting the cost of a monument to Grant. This leaves the question open as to whether the New York monument shall be a national or a local one. It is very possible that the great cities of the country which would have felt themselves called on to contribute to a monument at Washington may prefer to devote their contributions to local monuments. It is very desirable that whatever St. Louis does should be the work of the whole city, and it is therefore advisable that the example of New York should be promptly followed, and a committee appointed to act for the city.

NO NATION has ever shown more of genuine grief and sorrow, of deep affection and sense of loss than are shown by the tributes which the people of the United States are offering to the memory of Grant. There is no hamlet so remote and obscure that it does not share in the general movement, no city so great that the movement does not reach its whole population. The South vies with the North in paying its tributes of respect. The soldiers who fought under him are not more deeply affected than those who fought against him. All sectionalism is laid aside, all political contention is hushed, the nation is united in a common feeling, a feeling which honors the dead and does not hurt the living.

The outcrops are not helping their cause by the injudicious language in which too many of them are indulging. The disinterested public, seeing by and experience that private individuals, settlers and cultivators of the soil, are expelled from the Indian lands at the point of the bayonet, can not understand how cattle kings can acquire the right to occupy that territory, carry on a profitable trade, fence in the land and monopolize the whole grazing point.

billions of millions of acres. When the Government declares that the Indians as wards of the nation have no more right to bargain away their lands than wards of court have to transfer trust property, the view of the Government does not seem unreasonable. When the outcrops make answer by insinuating that corrupt motives are at the bottom of the attempt to enforce the law, they merely disgust and alienate a public opinion which common sense should teach them to cultivate.

In a recently published interview, Mr. W. H. VANDERBILT has flung a remarkable challenge into the faces of the American people. Representing the dividends paid on the New York Central enormous issues of watered stock—holding in his personal clutch the largest private fortune in the world as his share of the profits, and boasting that the New York Central, after buying up all competing lines still owns, besides, not less than \$100,000,000 worth of unencumbered real estate in New York—he coolly declared that it was able to crush any rival and would tolerate no competition. This boast was made in celebration of the consummation of his alliance, offensive and defensive, with the great Pennsylvania monopoly, whereby they are bound to aid each other in crushing out all competition and in imposing on the commerce of the country their own iniquitous edicts, in restraint of trade and in default violation of constitutions and laws. These money kings are entitled to credit for their "brutal frankness," if for nothing else. But how long will a free country submit to their aggression?

THERE is an adage among railroad men that "the poorer the road, the finer the president's car," and as the Wabash is just now about the poorest railroad between the blue vault of heaven and the dark abyss of bankruptcy, we are justified in saying that Senator VEST is just now traveling in fine style, if there is any truth in the following dispatch from St. Paul which appears in a morning paper:

A special Wabash car came in over the Milwaukee road this morning containing the following persons: Thomas E. Vest, president of the Wabash Road and president of the Third National Bank of St. Louis, accompanied by his wife and two children; United States Senator Vest of Missouri, also accompanied by his wife; Rodes Barret and sister of Kentucky. Messrs. Vest and Barret were found on the platform of the special car engaged in conversation. In answer to inquiries regarding the object of their trip they informed their correspondent that they were on a pleasure trip, and would go out on the Northern Pacific to-night.

We trust that the expense of transporting the receiver of the road and his family and the Senator and his family over the country does not come out of funds which should otherwise meet defaulted interest or liquidate pay rolls more promptly. If Senator Vest were to go dead-heading over the country at the expense of the Wabash in these times, it would materially interfere with his usefulness as a representative of the people hereafter.

THERE seems to be a disposition to find flaws in the party record of Mr. WALTER C. BACON of Kansas City, whose name has been used to pad out the very limited list of Democrats appointed by Collector HARBROOK. Now, while it may be true that the enrollment of Mr. BACON's name as a Democrat has caused some surprise at Kansas City, and the Chicago News story about his having lost a leg in the Confederate service is only a quizzing invention, it is in order to remind all concerned that the Democratic party has never yet adopted a naturalization law requiring new converts to tarry a term of years in the ante-room before being admitted to the inner temple of the party where the good things are. Mr. BACON reached Kansas City from Connecticut about the same time that Mr. HARBROOK arrived from Illinois, and though it may have taken more years, or perhaps even the election of a Democratic President to reconcile him to the Western ways of the Missouri Democracy, he may still be as good a Democrat as Mr. HARBROOK himself. There is a great deal of political ozone in the Kansas City atmosphere, and a great deal of oscillation, as it were, between Kansas Republicanism and Missouri Democracy, and the flopping there is liable to be somewhat sudden and sometimes surprising. But it is none the less vigorous, and generally means business. As long as Mr. BACON is in business with the Democratic party, we will bet on his loyalty to the firm.

EUROPEAN NOTES.

The event of the week in England has been, of course, the royal marriage. Afghan troubles, Egyptian matters, and Parliamentary squabbles sink into temporary insignificance in the august presence of the union of the houses of Brunswick and Battenberg. That aristocratic circle into which Madame Becky Sharp Crawley was introduced by the Marquis of Steyne has thrived from center to circumference with the preparations for and performance of a wedding which blends the fortunes and the blood of the Queen's youngest daughter and an impetuous German prince, and affords the British taxpayer the perhaps unappreciated honor and pleasure of footing the bills of another family of uncertain size, and unquestioned ability for expensive housekeeping. The proudest people in the three kingdoms have rushed and scurried for invitations to Whitehall and Church, while the greatest man in England declined an invitation, as he had previously declined the offer of an Earldom. Mr. Gladstone has not forgotten that when Prince Leopold was married his name was carefully omitted from the list of invited guests, and, very properly, improved the recent opportunity to remind his sovereign of the unparliamentary slight, and vindicate his own self-respect in unmistakable fashion. Gladstone was not the only distinguished personage who received cards and sent regrets. The Crown Prince and Princess of Germany, the Queen's son-in-law and daughter, and all their progeny are conspicuous by their absence; being represented at the ceremony only in the severest diplomatic style—by the German Ambassador to the Court of St. James. This has been to be abundant confirmation of the rumor that Frederick William and his wife regard the Battenberg business as a misalliance, and propose to treat it accordingly. The hurried departure, after the nuptial benediction, of the Prince and Princess of Wales and the Duke of Edinburgh, would seem to indicate in the directions of disapproval; so that the strange blossoms are slightly withered by family frowns, which may breed family fights some day. Yet Battenberg, though he may have less brains, has quite as much money as Prince Alfred had when Victoria married him; and it would require the services of a German generalist to decide which is the best stock, the Bismarck-Gotha or

the Battenbergs. However, it matters little now for the dead is done, and those who do not like it may diffuse it, and are relieved from the necessity of sending gifts and congratulations to the first children.

Next in importance to the marriage of Beatrice and Henry is the pretty little fight between Lord Lansdale and Mr. George Heywood over their respective claims to the position of Collector of Internal Revenue. It was "a set-to without gloves" according to "rough and tumble" rules, and according to latest advices Lansdale did not do as well in the field of Mars as he has done in the honor of Venus. We fear that he is not the only one who has gotten a black eye in this affair. No married lady's reputation is improved by such a struggle to her charms at Lansdale and Heywood have paid to those of the Jones, Lily and Mr. Langtry is anywhere around, he would better take his wife home and keep her there. Even lies can be smothered in the dirty atmosphere of London.

The dull monotony of Parliament has been relieved by the defeat of the Government on the medical relief bill, whatever that may be. The defeat was not fatal, as Sir Michael Hicks-Beach made haste to relinquish responsibility for the bill; but it shows on what a very slender thread Treasury power hangs, and it also shows that the Liberals have not received their expected pay-off for they voted solid against the Government. The Salisbury & Co. are not so anxious for a vote as they were thrown in, and the Liberals find themselves again in the saddle before Parliament adjourns. Meanwhile a ripple of discontent runs the hither smooth surface of Irish affairs, and the new Viceroy is not nearly so happy as he was. The Nationalists are getting up a monster petition, demanding the release of certain persons now imprisoned for alleged complicity in the Maffra massacre and other political murders. These persons were tried, convicted, and sentenced under the Spencer Administration; and if Carnarvon releases the prisoners, he will not only violate precedent, but offend his predecessor and irritate the Liberals—neither of which he nor the Government wish to do. If he refuses the petition, he will count upon the hostility of the Nationalists in and out of Parliament; and perhaps their action on the medical relief bill was meant as a warning. At any rate, all is not quiet along the Shannon, the Liffey, and the Lea; and there are signs of a not very remote conflict, of the usual sort, between the powers that be. Meanwhile Salisbury has taken occasion to enthusiastically eulogize Lord Spencer's administration in Ireland—which will please Spencer and not please the Irish.

Across the channel things have been very, very dull; so dull that Sunist Cox, American Minister to Constantinople, could not stand Paris more than two days, and was hurried away to his post of honor in Stambul—where he hopes to be as popular with the Sultan and the Circassian girls as was his illustrious predecessor, Law Wallace. Barring the drowning of a balloonist in the sea, a bad fire near Aix, unfavorable rumors from Annam and Tonquin, the suppression of a cut-throat gambling game in the Casino at Boulogne, and the repudiation of the London students in Parisian journals, French affairs have been as uninteresting as last year's almanac. But there are eighteen murders under sentence of death at Paris, with the provinces yet to hear from; and if President Grevy suspends his opposition to capital punishment long enough to allow these to be guillotined, his fellow citizens will have something to tell him about the next session reports for duty.

Prince Hohenzollern, present German ambassador at Paris, has been appointed Governor of Alsace-Lorraine, and Emperor William has agreed to meet Emperor Francis Joseph at the 15th of August. The old gentlemen are already there, waiting for the younger one; but no importance is attached to the conference, which is mainly a matter of ceremony. The lay together of a pair of crowned heads does not disturb Europe as it used to. Emperors and Kings may propose, but it is a people's disposal.

In Austria fifty-three of the Brunns voters have been sent to prison for demanding more pay and less work, and there has been a slight panic in the Vienna stock market on account of possible war between Russia and England. Crop prospects do not improve materially either in Austria or Russia; and the latter country proposes to swell its shrinking revenues by imposing a tax of from 100 to 200 roubles upon every foreigner who stays on Russian soil longer than a fortnight. The Afghan negotiations are still in a demoralized condition, and it is said that the Government contemplates the proposal to "Kashgar" which will lead to "delimitation." Meanwhile, semi-official journals hint strongly at the occupation of Herat, and say that such movement on the part of Russia ought not to bring war with England—which, nevertheless, is doubtfully true.

The new Archbishop of Dublin, Dr. Walsh, has arrived in Rome some time ago, and is now in the city, who appreciates the difficulties of the Irish situation, and wisely advises the Archbishop to "go slow," and do as little secular talking and writing as possible. Official reports of the Swiss authorities say that the leaders of the Anarchists are nearly all Germans or Austrians, and recommend their expulsion. The Anarchists declare that if the expulsion policy is enforced they will make their headquarters in Switzerland by blowing up public buildings and functioning with dynamite and dispatch. And so the case rests for the present. Turkey is waiting for Cox, and cherishing fond hopes that she will be called in to take charge of the Bosphorus, rule and rob that region in the good old Turkish way, and catch and hang the Mahdi, if he is still living. At last accounts that immortal individual was dead of small pox, and a shadowy Arab had been arrested in Cairo who had attended the funeral. From poor old Spain, nothing but cholera, which is "worse and more of it," and no immediate prospect of improvement.

O'NEILL ON SLATES.

The Member from the Eighth District has been in the city for some time. He is a Republican. "I want it understood," said Hon. John J. O'Neill, last evening, "that Mr. Martin Clardy shall not be permitted to pose as a patriot and a protector of the interests of the Democratic party at my expense. I don't care how much he poses or what degree of credit he manages to derive from it, but I don't propose that he shall stand on my neck while he is acting in this manner."

"Why, he is misrepresented anything!" "He most certainly has. I see that he and Mr. Glover are buying themselves among the departments at Washington, and are telling the correspondents that they were not parties to any proceeding by which action of the caucus on the railroad matter was taken. I don't understand how they can make a representation of that kind. Now, if you will look at the Republican and Globe-Democrat of March 15 you will find reports which correspond with each other in substance as to what that caucus did. Those reports were correct and their correctness was never questioned. Inasmuch as I think that is a disposition to be called meeting of the members, I can't understand how they can make a representation of that kind. Now, if you will look at the Republican and Globe-Democrat of March 15 you will find reports which correspond with each other in substance as to what that caucus did. Those reports were correct and their correctness was never questioned. Inasmuch as I think that is a disposition to be called meeting of the members, I can't understand how they can make a representation of that kind. Now, if you will look at the Republican and Globe-Democrat of March 15 you will find reports which correspond with each other in substance as to what that caucus did. Those reports were correct and their correctness was never questioned. Inasmuch as I think that is a disposition to be called meeting of the members, I can't understand how they can make a representation of that kind. Now, if you will look at the Republican and Globe-Democrat of March 15 you will find reports which correspond with each other in substance as to what that caucus did. Those reports were correct and their correctness was never questioned. Inasmuch as I think that is a disposition to be called meeting of the members, I can't understand how they can make a representation of that kind. Now, if you will look at the Republican and Globe-Democrat of March 15 you will find reports which correspond with each other in substance as to what that caucus did. Those reports were correct and their correctness was never questioned. Inasmuch as I think that is a disposition to be called meeting of the members, I can't understand how they can make a representation of that kind. Now, if you will look at the Republican and Globe-Democrat of March 15 you will find reports which correspond with each other in substance as to what that caucus did. Those reports were correct and their correctness was never questioned. Inasmuch as I think that is a disposition to be called meeting of the members, I can't understand how they can make a representation of that kind. Now, if you will look at the Republican and Globe-Democrat of March 15 you will find reports which correspond with each other in substance as to what that caucus did. Those reports were correct and their correctness was never questioned. Inasmuch as I think that is a disposition to be called meeting of the members, I can't understand how they can make a representation of that kind. Now, if you will look at the Republican and Globe-Democrat of March 15 you will find reports which correspond with each other in substance as to what that caucus did. Those reports were correct and their correctness was never questioned. Inasmuch as I think that is a disposition to be called meeting of the members, I can't understand how they can make a representation of that kind. Now, if you will look at the Republican and Globe-Democrat of March 15 you will find reports which correspond with each other in substance as to what that caucus did. Those reports were correct and their correctness was never questioned. Inasmuch as I think that is a disposition to be called meeting of the members, I can't understand how they can make a representation of that kind. Now, if you will look at the Republican and Globe-Democrat of March 15 you will find reports which correspond with each other in substance as to what that caucus did. Those reports were correct and their correctness was never questioned. Inasmuch as I think that is a disposition to be called meeting of the members, I can't understand how they can make a representation of that kind. Now, if you will look at the Republican and Globe-Democrat of March 15 you will find reports which correspond with each other in substance as to what that caucus did. Those reports were correct and their correctness was never questioned. Inasmuch as I think that is a disposition to be called meeting of the members, I can't understand how they can make a representation of that kind. Now, if you will look at the Republican and Globe-Democrat of March 15 you will find reports which correspond with each other in substance as to what that caucus did. Those reports were correct and their correctness was never questioned. Inasmuch as I think that is a disposition to be called meeting of the members, I can't understand how they can make a representation of that kind. Now, if you will look at the Republican and Globe-Democrat of March 15 you will find reports which correspond with each other in substance as to what that caucus did. Those reports were correct and their correctness was never questioned. Inasmuch as I think that is a disposition to be called meeting of the members, I can't understand how they can make a representation of that kind. Now, if you will look at the Republican and Globe-Democrat of March 15 you will find reports which correspond with each other in substance as to what that caucus did. Those reports were correct and their correctness was never questioned. Inasmuch as I think that is a disposition to be called meeting of the members, I can't understand how they can make a representation of that kind. Now, if you will look at the Republican and Globe-Democrat of March 15 you will find reports which correspond with each other in substance as to what that caucus did. Those reports were correct and their correctness was never questioned. Inasmuch as I think that is a disposition to be called meeting of the members, I can't understand how they can make a representation of that kind. Now, if you will look at the Republican and Globe-Democrat of March 15 you will find reports which correspond with each other in substance as to what that caucus did. Those reports were correct and their correctness was never questioned. Inasmuch as I think that is a disposition to be called meeting of the members, I can't understand how they can make a representation of that kind. Now, if you will look at the Republican and Globe-Democrat of March 15 you will find reports which correspond with each other in substance as to what that caucus did. Those reports were correct and their correctness was never questioned. Inasmuch as I think that is a disposition to be called meeting of the members, I can't understand how they can make a representation of that kind. Now, if you will look at the Republican and Globe-Democrat of March 15 you will find reports which correspond with each other in substance as to what that caucus did. Those reports were correct and their correctness was never questioned. Inasmuch as I think that is a disposition to be called meeting of the members, I can't understand how they can make a representation of that kind. Now, if you will look at the Republican and Globe-Democrat of March 15 you will find reports which correspond with each other in substance as to what that caucus did. Those reports were correct and their correctness was never questioned. Inasmuch as I think that is a disposition to be called meeting of the members, I can't understand how they can make a representation of that kind. Now, if you will look at the Republican and Globe-Democrat of March 15 you will find reports which correspond with each other in substance as to what that caucus did. Those reports were correct and their correctness was never questioned. Inasmuch as I think that is a disposition to be called meeting of the members, I can't understand how they can make a representation of that kind. Now, if you will look at the Republican and Globe-Democrat of March 15 you will find reports which correspond with each other in substance as to what that caucus did. Those reports were correct and their correctness was never questioned. Inasmuch as I think that is a disposition to be called meeting of the members, I can't understand how they can make a representation of that kind. Now, if you will look at the Republican and Globe-Democrat of March 15 you will find reports which correspond with each other in substance as to what that caucus did. Those reports were correct and their correctness was never questioned. Inasmuch as I think that is a disposition to be called meeting of the members, I can't understand how they can make a representation of that kind. Now, if you will look at the Republican and Globe-Democrat of March 15 you will find reports which correspond with each other in substance as to what that caucus did. Those reports were correct and their correctness was never questioned. Inasmuch as I think that is a disposition to be called meeting of the members, I can't understand how they can make a representation of that kind. Now, if you will look at the Republican and Globe-Democrat of March 15 you will find reports which correspond with each other in substance as to what that caucus did. Those reports were correct and their correctness was never questioned. Inasmuch as I think that is a disposition to be called meeting of the members, I can't understand how they can make a representation of that kind. Now, if you will look at the Republican and Globe-Democrat of March 15 you will find reports which correspond with each other in substance as to what that caucus did. Those reports were correct and their correctness was never questioned. Inasmuch as I think that is a disposition to be called meeting of the members, I can't understand how they can make a representation of that kind. Now, if you will look at the Republican and Globe-Democrat of March 15 you will find reports which correspond with each other in substance as to what that caucus did. Those reports were correct and their correctness was never questioned. Inasmuch as I think that is a disposition to be called meeting of the members, I can't understand how they can make a representation of that kind. Now, if you will look at the Republican and Globe-Democrat of March 15 you will find reports which correspond with each other in substance as to what that caucus did. Those reports were correct and their correctness was never questioned. Inasmuch as I think that is a disposition to be called meeting of the members, I can't understand how they can make a representation of that kind. Now, if you will look at the Republican and Globe-Democrat of March 15 you will find reports which correspond with each other in substance as to what that caucus did. Those reports were correct and their correctness was never questioned. Inasmuch as I think that is a disposition to be called meeting of the members, I can't understand how they can make a representation of that kind. Now, if you will look at the Republican and Globe-Democrat of March 15 you will find reports which correspond with each other in substance as to what that caucus did. Those reports were correct and their correctness was never questioned. Inasmuch as I think that is a disposition to be called meeting of the members, I can't understand how they can make a representation of that kind. Now, if you will look at the Republican and Globe-Democrat of March 15 you will find reports which correspond with each other in substance as to what that caucus did. Those reports were correct and their correctness was never questioned. Inasmuch as I think that is a disposition to be called meeting of the members, I can't understand how they can make a representation of that kind. Now, if you will look at the Republican and Globe-Democrat of March 15 you will find reports which correspond with each other in substance as to what that caucus did. Those reports were correct and their correctness was never questioned. Inasmuch as I think that is a disposition to be called meeting of the members, I can't understand how they can make a representation of that kind. Now, if you will look at the Republican and Globe-Democrat of March 15 you will find reports which correspond with each other in substance as to what that caucus did. Those reports were correct and their correctness was never questioned. Inasmuch as I think that is a disposition to be called meeting of the members, I can't understand how they can make a representation of that kind. Now, if you will look at the Republican and Globe-Democrat of March 15 you will find reports which correspond with each other in substance as to what that caucus did. Those reports were correct and their correctness was never questioned. Inasmuch as I think that is a disposition to be called meeting of the members, I can't understand how they can make a representation of that kind. Now, if you will look at the Republican and Globe-Democrat of March 15 you will find reports which correspond with each other in substance as to what that caucus did. Those reports were correct and their correctness was never questioned. Inasmuch as I think that is a disposition to be called meeting of the members, I can't understand how they can make a representation of that kind. Now, if you will look at the Republican and Globe-Democrat of March 15 you will find reports which correspond with each other in substance as to what that caucus did. Those reports were correct and their correctness was never questioned. Inasmuch as I think that is a disposition to be called meeting of the members, I can't understand how they can make a representation of that kind. Now, if you will look at the Republican and Globe-Democrat of March 15 you will find reports which correspond with each other in substance as to what that caucus did. Those reports were correct and their correctness was never questioned. Inasmuch as I think that is a disposition to be called meeting of the members, I can't understand how they can make a representation of that kind. Now, if you will look at the Republican and Globe-Democrat of March 15 you will find reports which correspond with each other in substance as to what that caucus did. Those reports were correct and their correctness was never questioned. Inasmuch as I think that is a disposition to be called meeting of the members, I can't understand how they can make a representation of that kind. Now, if you will look at the Republican and Globe-Democrat of March 15 you will find reports which correspond with each other in substance as to what that caucus did. Those reports were correct and their correctness was never questioned. Inasmuch as I think that is a disposition to be called meeting of the members, I can't understand how they can make a representation of that kind. Now, if you will look at the Republican and Globe-Democrat of March 15 you will find reports which correspond with each other in substance as to what that caucus did. Those reports were correct and their correctness was never questioned. Inasmuch as I think that is a disposition to be called meeting of the members, I can't understand how they can make a representation of that kind. Now, if you will look at the Republican and Globe-Democrat of March 15 you will find reports which correspond with each other in substance as to what that caucus did. Those reports were correct and their correctness was never questioned. Inasmuch as I think that is a disposition to be called meeting of the members, I can't understand how they can make a representation of that kind. Now, if you will look at the Republican and Globe-Democrat of March 15 you will find reports which correspond with each other in substance as to what that caucus did. Those reports were correct and their correctness was never questioned. Inasmuch as I think that is a disposition to be called meeting of the members, I can't understand how they can make a representation of that kind. Now, if you will look at the Republican and Globe-Democrat of March 15 you will find reports which correspond with each other in substance as to what that caucus did. Those reports were correct and their correctness was never questioned. Inasmuch as I think that is a disposition to be called meeting of the members, I can't understand how they can make a representation of that kind. Now, if you will look at the Republican and Globe-Democrat of March 15 you will find reports which correspond with each other in substance as to what that caucus did. Those reports were correct and their correctness was never questioned. Inasmuch as I think that is a disposition to be called meeting of the members, I can't understand how they can make a representation of that kind. Now, if you will look at the Republican and Globe-Democrat of March 15 you will find reports which correspond with each other in substance as to what that caucus did. Those reports were correct and their correctness was never questioned. Inasmuch as I think that is a disposition to be called meeting of the members, I can't understand how they can make a representation of that kind. Now, if you will look at the Republican and Globe-Democrat of March 15 you will find reports which correspond with each other in substance as to what that caucus did. Those reports were correct and their correctness was never questioned. Inasmuch as I think that is a disposition to be called meeting of the members, I can't understand how they can make a representation of that kind. Now, if you will look at the Republican and Globe-Democrat of March 15 you will find reports which correspond with each other in substance as to what that caucus did. Those reports were correct and their correctness was never questioned. Inasmuch as I think that is a disposition to be called meeting of the members, I can't understand how they can make a representation of that kind. Now, if you will look at the Republican and Globe-Democrat of March 15 you will find reports which correspond with each other in substance as to what that caucus did. Those reports were correct and their correctness was never questioned. Inasmuch as I think that is a disposition to be called meeting of the members, I can't understand how they can make a representation of that kind. Now, if you will look at the Republican and Globe-Democrat of March 15 you will find reports which correspond with each other in substance as to what that caucus did. Those reports were correct and their correctness was never questioned. Inasmuch as I think that is a disposition to be called meeting of the members, I can't understand how they can make a representation of that kind. Now, if you will look at the Republican and Globe-Democrat of March 15 you will find reports which correspond with each other in substance as to what that caucus did. Those reports were correct and their correctness was never questioned. Inasmuch as I think that is a disposition to be called meeting of the members, I can't understand how they can make a representation of that kind. Now, if you will look at the Republican and Globe-Democrat of March 15 you will find reports which correspond with each other in substance as to what that caucus did. Those reports were correct and their correctness was never questioned. Inasmuch as I think that is a disposition to be called meeting of the members, I can't understand how they can make a representation of that kind. Now, if you will look at the Republican and Globe-Democrat of March 15 you will find reports which correspond with each other in substance as to what that caucus did. Those reports were correct and their correctness was never questioned. Inasmuch as I think that is a disposition to be called meeting of the members, I can't understand how they can make a representation of that kind. Now, if you will look at the Republican and Globe-Democrat of March 15 you will find reports which correspond with each other in substance as to what that caucus did. Those reports were correct and their correctness was never questioned. Inasmuch as I think that is a disposition to be called meeting of the members, I can't understand how they can make a representation of that kind. Now, if you will look at the Republican and Globe-Democrat of March 15 you will find reports which correspond with each other in substance as to what that caucus did. Those reports were correct and their correctness was never questioned. Inasmuch as I think that is a disposition to be called meeting of the members, I can't understand how they can make a representation of that kind. Now, if you will look at the Republican and Globe-Democrat of March 15 you will find reports which correspond with each other in substance as to what that caucus did. Those reports were correct and their correctness was never questioned. Inasmuch as I think that is a disposition to be called meeting of the members, I can't understand how they can make a representation of that kind. Now, if you will look at the Republican and Globe-Democrat of March 15 you will find reports which correspond with each other in substance as to what that caucus did. Those reports were correct and their correctness was never questioned. Inasmuch as I think that is a disposition to be called meeting of the members, I can't understand how they can make a representation of that kind. Now, if you will look at the Republican and Globe-Democrat of March 15 you will find reports which correspond with each other in substance as to what that caucus did. Those reports were correct and their correctness was never questioned. Inasmuch as I think that is a disposition to be called meeting of the members, I can't understand how they can make a representation of that kind. Now, if you will look at the Republican and Globe-Democrat of March 15 you will find reports which correspond with each other in substance as to what that caucus did. Those reports were correct and their correctness was never questioned. Inasmuch as I think that is a disposition to be called meeting of the members, I can't understand how they can make a representation of that kind. Now, if you will look at the Republican and Globe-Democrat of March 15 you will find reports which correspond with each other in substance as to what that caucus did. Those reports were correct and their correctness was never questioned. Inasmuch as I think that is a disposition to be called meeting of the members, I can't understand how they can make a representation of that kind. Now, if you will look at the Republican and Globe-Democrat of March 15 you will find reports which correspond with each other in substance as to what that caucus did. Those reports were correct and their correctness was never questioned. Inasmuch as I think that is a disposition to be called meeting of the members, I can't understand how they can make a representation of that kind. Now, if you will look at the Republican and Globe-Democrat of March 15 you will find reports which correspond with each other in substance as to what that caucus did. Those reports were correct and their correctness was never questioned. Inasmuch as I think that is a disposition to be called meeting of the members, I can't understand how they can make a representation of that kind. Now, if you will look at the Republican and Globe-Democrat of March 15 you will find reports which correspond with each other in substance as to what that caucus did. Those reports were correct and their correctness was never questioned. Inasmuch as I think that is a disposition to be called meeting of the members, I can't understand how they can make a representation of that kind. Now, if you will look at the Republican and Globe-Democrat of March 15 you will find reports which correspond with each other in substance as to what that caucus did. Those reports were correct and their correctness was never questioned. Inasmuch as I think that is a disposition to be called meeting of the members, I can't understand how they can make a representation of that kind. Now, if you will look at the Republican and Globe-Democrat of March 15 you will find reports which correspond with each other in substance as to what that caucus did. Those reports were correct and their correctness was never questioned. Inasmuch as I think that is a disposition to be called meeting of the members, I can't understand how they can make a representation of that kind. Now, if you will look at the Republican and Globe-Democrat of March 15 you will find reports which correspond with each other in substance as to what that caucus did. Those reports were correct and their correctness was never questioned. Inasmuch as I think that is a disposition to be called meeting of the members, I can't understand how they can make a representation of that kind. Now, if you will look at the Republican and Globe-Democrat of March 15 you will find reports which correspond with each other in substance as to what that caucus did. Those reports were correct and their correctness was never questioned. Inasmuch as I think that is a disposition to be called meeting of the members, I can't understand how they can make a representation of that kind. Now, if you will look at the Republican and Globe-Democrat of March 15 you will find reports which correspond with each other in substance as to what that caucus did. Those reports were correct and their correctness was never questioned. Inasmuch as I think that is a disposition to be called meeting of the members, I can't understand how they can make a representation of that kind. Now, if you will look at the Republican and Globe-Democrat of March 15 you will find reports which correspond with each other in substance as to what that caucus did. Those reports were correct and their correctness was never questioned. Inasmuch as I think that is a disposition to be called meeting of the members, I can't understand how they can make a representation of that kind. Now, if you will look at the Republican and Globe-Democrat of March 15 you will find reports which correspond with each other in substance as to what that caucus did. Those reports were correct and their correctness was never questioned. Inasmuch as I think that is a disposition to be called meeting of the members, I can't understand how they can make a representation of that kind. Now, if you will look at the Republican and Globe-Democrat of March 15 you will find reports which correspond with each other in substance as to what that caucus did. Those reports were correct and their correctness was never questioned. Inasmuch as I think that is a disposition to be called meeting of the members, I can't understand how they can make a representation of that kind. Now, if you will look at the Republican and Globe-Democrat of March 15 you will find reports which correspond with each other in substance as to what that caucus did. Those reports were correct and their correctness was never questioned. Inasmuch as I think that is a disposition to be called meeting of the members, I can't understand how they can make a representation of that kind. Now, if you will look at the Republican and Globe-Democrat of March 15 you will find reports which correspond with each other in substance as to what that caucus did. Those reports were correct and their correctness was never questioned. Inasmuch as I think that is a disposition to be called meeting of the members, I can't understand how they can make a representation of that kind. Now, if you will look at the Republican and Globe-Democrat of March 15 you will find reports which correspond with each other in substance as to what that caucus did. Those reports were correct and their correctness was never questioned. Inasmuch as I think that is a disposition to be called meeting of the members, I can't understand how they can make a representation of that kind. Now, if you will look at the Republican and Globe-Democrat of March 15 you will find reports which correspond with each other in substance as to what that caucus did. Those reports were correct and their correctness was never questioned. Inasmuch as I think that is a disposition to be called meeting of the members, I can't understand how they can make a representation of that kind. Now, if you will look at the Republican and Globe-Democrat of March 15 you will find reports which correspond with each other in substance as to what that caucus did. Those reports were correct and their correctness was never questioned. Inasmuch as I think that is a disposition to be called meeting of the members, I can't understand how they can make a representation of that kind. Now, if you will look at the Republican and Globe-Democrat of March 15 you will find reports which correspond with each other in substance as to what that caucus did. Those reports were correct and their correctness was never questioned. Inasmuch as I think that is a disposition to be called meeting of the members, I can't understand how they can make a representation of that kind. Now, if you will look at the Republican and Globe-Democrat of March 15 you will find reports which correspond with each other in substance as to what that caucus did. Those reports were correct and their correctness was never questioned. Inasmuch as I think that is a disposition to be called meeting of the members, I can't understand how they can make a representation of that kind. Now, if you will look at the Republican and Globe-Democrat of March 15 you will find reports which correspond with each other in substance as to what that caucus did. Those reports were correct and their correctness was never questioned. Inasmuch as I think that is a disposition to be called meeting of the members, I can't understand how they can make a representation of that kind. Now, if you will look at the Republican and Globe-Democrat of March 15 you will find reports which correspond with each other in substance as to what that caucus did. Those reports were correct and their correctness was never questioned. Inasmuch as I think that is a disposition to be called meeting of the members, I can't understand how they can make a representation of that kind. Now, if you will look at the Republican and Globe-Democrat of March 15 you will find reports which correspond with each other in substance as to what that caucus did. Those reports were correct and their correctness was never questioned. Inasmuch as I think that is a disposition to be called meeting of the members, I can't understand how they can make a representation of that kind. Now, if you will look at the Republican and Globe-Democrat of March 15 you will find reports which correspond with each other in substance as to what that caucus did. Those reports were correct and their correctness was never questioned. Inasmuch as I think that is a disposition to be called meeting of the members, I can't understand how they can make a representation of that kind. Now, if you will look at the Republican and Globe-Democrat of March 15 you will find reports which correspond with each other in substance as to what that caucus did. Those reports were correct and their correctness was never questioned. Inasmuch as I think that is a disposition to be called meeting of the members, I can't understand how they can make a representation of that kind. Now, if you will look at the Republican and Globe-Democrat of March 15 you will find reports which correspond with each other in substance as to what that caucus did. Those reports were correct and their correctness was never questioned. Inasmuch as I think that is a disposition to be called meeting of the members, I can't understand how they can make a representation of that kind. Now, if you will look at the Republican and Globe-Democrat of March 15 you will find reports which correspond with each other in substance as to what that caucus did. Those reports were correct and their correctness was never questioned. Inasmuch as I think that is a disposition to be called meeting of the members, I can't understand how they can make a representation of that kind. Now, if you will look at the Republican and Globe-Democrat of March 15 you will find reports which correspond with each other in substance as to what that caucus did. Those reports were correct and their correctness was never questioned. Inasmuch as I think that is a disposition to be called meeting of the members, I can't understand how they can make a representation of that kind. Now, if you will look at the Republican and Globe-Democrat of March 15 you will find reports which correspond with each other in substance as to what that caucus did. Those reports were correct and their correctness was never questioned. Inasmuch as I think that is a disposition to be called meeting of the members, I can't understand how they can make a representation of that kind. Now, if you will look at the Republican and Globe-Democrat of March 15 you will find reports which correspond with each other in substance as to what that caucus did. Those reports were correct and their correctness was never questioned. Inasmuch as I think that is a disposition to be called meeting of the members, I can't understand how they can make a representation of that kind. Now, if you will look at the Republican and Globe-Democrat of March 15 you will find reports which correspond with each other in substance as to what that caucus did. Those reports were correct and their correctness was never questioned. Inasmuch as I think that is a disposition to be called meeting of the members, I can't understand how they can make a representation of that kind. Now, if you will look at the Republican and Globe-Democrat of March 15 you will find reports which correspond with each other in substance as to what that caucus did. Those reports were correct and their correctness was never questioned. Inasmuch as I think that is a disposition to be

**Base-Ball and Racing Events—Some
Remarks About Bicyclists That Are
Not Amateurs—The Lucas Club's
Tour—Diamond Chips and Sporting
Sundries.**
